



MO. 3

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

ECLECTIC PHYSICIANS

OF

CINCINNATI AND COVINGTON.

In pursuance of a notice published through the Cincinnati Daily Times, the following gentlemen, *Eclectic Physicians* of Cincinnati and Covington, assembled in the Hall of the Eclectic Medical Institute, viz :

W. BYRD POWELL,

J. KING,

R. S. NEWTON,

Z. FREEMAN,

J. R. BUCHANAN,

P. K. WOLBAUGH,

THOMAS CUSCADEN,

H. A. WARRINGER,

P. HENRY HALE,

JAMES ADAMS,

J. C. THOMAS,

J. E. STEPHENSON,

O. E. NEWTON,

S. KYLE,

J. MILTON YOUNG,

A. C. HEWITT.

On motion of Prof. J. R. BUCHANAN, Prof. W. BYRD POWELL, of Covington, Ky., was elected President of the meeting, and on motion of Prof. R. S. NEWTON, Dr. P. HENRY HALE was elected Secretary.

Whereon, Prof. R. S. NEWTON explained the objects of the meeting, and with reference to them the President then addressed the meeting as follows :

REMARKS OF PROF. POWELL.

"Ex-Professor Jones and myself have always been on social and friendly terms; I have, therefore, no motive to indulge in any unkind remarks or reflections concerning him. I have read his late pamphlet, and from its personal, rancorous and revengeful tone, I am forced to conclude that the promotion of the Eclectic Medical Institute, of this city, is not his object. It appears to me that no one can read it and avoid the conclusion that he would willingly destroy the Institution and the prospects of its cause in the West, to ruin Professor Buchanan and to cripple the other members of the Faculty. With such a feeling I have no sympathy. But to such a mind as his the existing Faculty of the Institute may have given ample cause for all the malignity he has manifested. However this may be, the quarrel between him and the said Faculty is, legitimately, no business of ours upon this occasion. We have assembled here to consider upon the means essential to a successful counteraction of any deleterious influence which the pamphlet of Ex-Professor Jones may have, in consideration of the relation which he at one time held to the Institute and the cause of medical reform, and not for the purpose of abusing him or of defend-

ing the Faculty—for we hold that the Faculty and the cause in which they are engaged are two independent or entirely different subjects. If the feelings of the present Faculty be really in harmony with the spirit of medical reform,—if they be capable teachers, diligent and faithful in the discharge of their duties to the Institute,—then the Institution is in that condition which should entirely satisfy its friends—that portion of the public which is interested in medical reform. In the discharge of our duty upon this occasion, we are not, in my opinion, called upon to repair either the real or the imaginary wrongs which the Faculty are charged with having inflicted upon Professor Jones; and if we are to regard his pamphlet as a true index of the depth and strength of his hatred for the Faculty, and particularly of Professor Buchanan, we may rest assured that nothing less than their extirpation will satisfy him. And, although it is proper that we should respect Professor Jones and his associate, Dr. Baldridge, with all their prejudices, yet it would be very unwise in us to so outrage a great natural law as to save them and destroy the Institute, because in the course of events they were required, for the supposed success of the cause, to leave it.

It is not necessary for us to enquire whether, in the abstract, Professor Jones was justly or unjustly expelled from the Eclectic Medical Institute, it is enough for us to know that it was relatively correct and necessary—correct, with reference to the cause in which all of them were engaged. Six of the Faculty united in purpose and harmonized in action, and standing opposed to this union, and thwarting this action was the one individual, Professor Jones; and in cases of this kind it is perhaps impossible for any Board of Trustees to judge, according to the laws of abstract justice, but involved in the premises there were three facts of which they could not be ignorant, namely : the principle, or school must go on ;—it is more probable, *ceteris paribus*, that one man should err, than six ; and lastly, it is less difficult to fill one vacancy than six.

The correctness of these principles will be admitted, we may presume, by every sound mind, and if Professor Jones had acted in accordance with them, after his expulsion, he would have risen in public estimation, but, unfortunately, he yielded to the suggestions of his animal man and has fallen below the possibility of redemption. In this emergency it was natural that many of his personal friends, out of the school and in the class, should sympathize and go with him—would outrage fundamental principles through the impulse of the occasion ; hence we can entertain no reasonable doubt that three-fourths of those students and friends who acted with him, have, through the revolutionizing influence of the cool, calm and sober second thought, brought themselves back to a proper state of feeling and action. It is upon this principle, and this alone, that we can explain what I believe to be the fact, viz. : that this pamphlet was delivered from the press in an *unviable* condition. Between the feelings of the writer, as conveyed in the pamphlet, and those of the public, there is no agreement. So truly have I found this to be the case, that I have not a doubt but that the little chloroform we shall administer to it to-night, will consign it to eternal rest.

Professor Jones has made many charges against some members of the Faculty ; and some of these are serious—of vital importance, because they involve the professional principles of the Institution ; and I am asked whether they will not have a mischievous influence upon the prosperity of the Institute. I answer; they may, with a few of the less gifted and enlightened, but even with these, under the light of truth they can no longer exist than dew upon the warbler's wing under the influence of the morning sun. It is easy to make charges, and it is equally easy to present plausible evidence of their truth, but the intelligent and judicious are not going to act without knowing something about the opposing evidence, or the privilege of a cross-examination, more especially as the author of them has not entirely eclipsed, either intellectually or morally, all of his former colleagues, in public opinion. He has made one charge against Professor Newton which I know to be false, and I have every reason to believe that he was, long since, assured that it was false, and yet he

OF CINCINNATI AND COVINGTON.

W T 25 OCT

says that he was "credibly" informed of it. Now it so happens that I know that he could not have been credibly informed of it, unless the statement of a liar could be construed into credible evidence, and I am very much of the opinion that all of his matter-of-fact accusations are like it—either garbled statements about facts or absolute falsehoods, though he may be innocent of their fabrication. He states that he has been informed that Professor Newton authorized or sanctioned a statement that appeared in the Bulletin of the Memphis Institute, to this effect, that that Institution was thoroughly Allopathic, (according to the modern definition of this word; calomel, antimony and the lancet.) Now the fact is, that Newton and myself were up here when that statement appeared in the Bulletin at Memphis, and when we arrived there we had the matter investigated, and found that Professor Hulce had not only had it done, but had to LIE to get it done by those who had charge of the press, and of this fact Professor Jones has been far more credibly informed than he ever was of the contrary. Let it be understood that I was the founder of that Institution—that the trustees gave me all power in the premises, ratifying all my act's,—that I selected all the professors,—that I selected Professor Newton, and did it upon the *faith* that he was an Eclectic, (according to the present reformatory meaning of the word,) that ever since I have had more personal intimacy with him than with any other individual, and finally, that I have never discovered the smallest tendency in his mind to waver or doubt the soundness of his adopted professional principles—at this moment I could as easily doubt the faithfulness of the magnetic needle, as Newton's to modern Eclecticism. After all this, what must be my impressions as to the soundness of Professor Jones' charges upon the Faculty, particularly that of pseudo-Eclecticism?

The largest portion of Dr. Jones' pamphlet is devoted to the destruction of Professor Buchanan; he has produced numerous, I can not say weighty, testimonials to prove that his doctrines are visionary and useless—even incomprehensible. I can endorse for him here, for I have heard students—yes, many of them, say as much. And he states that even his colleagues have said as much. Well, suppose that both professors and students said so, what of it? Neither professors nor students, nor even yet, Professor Jones, have said that he is not a talented man, a ready writer, and a fluent lecturer—that he has not been one of the main pillars of the Institution since his election into it.

I remember distinctly that when a student of medicine at Lexington, Ky., that some of the professors and many of the students regarded Professor Caldwell's doctrines as visionary and incomprehensible; and I was one of them. The same objections were made to Professor Jackson of Philadelphia. Then why were not these gentlemen expelled from their distinguished schools respectively? Because they were able men—able, because they had the power to make the students think, and consequently to make them more effective. Professor Buchanan's condition is precisely parallel—he has not been so fortunate as to make all his colleagues and students believe his doctrines to be true and useful, and on the other hand, his disbelievers have not succeeded in proving them to be false and mischievous. If Professor Jones will do this, I now pledge myself to give him my feeble assistance in having him removed from the school. It should be remembered that Professor Buchanan's department is measurably literary, and therefore it provides a large field for suggestion when facts can not be had, and we have frequently done Professor Buchanan the justice to say that we knew of no one who has more power of making others think, who can think, than he, and if Professor Jones have failed to be benefitted, in this wise, by his intercourse with him, the fault is his own misfortune.

Professor Jones charges Professor Buchanan with being a dictator—with possessing a spirit of dictation. For ought that we know to the contrary, this charge may be well founded. But as a more harmonious Faculty than the one that now has charge of the Institute, perhaps never existed, it follows that the other six are good and loyal subjects—it proves more, namely: that Professor Jones has neither the power to govern, nor the humility to obey—to

lead nor to follow. It may be worthy of historical recollection to remark, that in many periods of the world, men, similarly constituted have existed.

As my purpose is neither to prosecute nor defend in the premises, but simply to satisfy the public, to the extent of my influence, that the utmost harmony and social feeling prevail in the present Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, and that the said Institution was never more worthy of public confidence, nor more capable of public usefulness than it now is, I beg leave, gentlemen, to trespass a little while longer upon your patience.

It has been my privilege to hear lectures in a dozen or more Medical Colleges, and this, one would reasonably suppose, should qualify a medical gentleman for judging pretty accurately of the relative strength and the usual peculiarities of medical faculties. After graduating in Lexington University, I visited Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore, each of which contained two medical schools, and as some of these schools were much distinguished, it may well be supposed that a young Western frontier-man would expect to find more professional ability than the West could furnish; at all events, this was my expectation, but to my great disappointment I soon discovered that I had left a school that was incomparably superior to either of them in useful and practical ability to teach; and the peculiarity common to all of them which I observed, was this: neither of those schools had more than three useful and respectably able teachers. The University of Philadelphia, that of New York, and that of Baltimore, had each one professor who, as a teacher, was inferior to any professor I have ever known in the West, and yet one of these was distinguished for his science. It has been my observation up to this time, that mediocrity is characteristic of a majority of every faculty I have seen.

Now, gentlemen, allow me to give my attention to the faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati. Inasmuch as Professor Jones objects very strongly to Professor Buchanan as a teacher, not because of any deficiency of talent, but because he is, in his opinion, visionary and somewhat heterodox; (and here let it be remembered that Professor Jones is too modest to *dictate* to other Professors what they shall teach,) and he is of the opinion, too, that Professors Bickley, Hoyt and Sherwood are not the exactly *simon-pure*. I will lay them aside, more especially as I have never heard the three latter, (and Professor Newton too, I should have had to command to stand aside, if my evidence did not vindicate him.) To dispose thus of these gentlemen is not proper in one who has it in his power to bear favorable testimony in their behalf, therefore I am pleased to add that I have heard the most talented of the students express themselves in the highest terms of commendation of their efficiency and excellence as teachers. But with reference to Newton, Freeman, and King, the only members of the present faculty of the Institute of whom, as professors, I have any personal knowledge, I may speak more freely and emphatically. When I selected them as colleagues for myself in the South, I was of the opinion that they possessed the requisite talent and energy to make a name for themselves. Now let me ask, have they not done it, and that too in the short space of four years? I know these gentlemen, I have tried them, and now express it as my honest conviction that they will compare favorably, as teachers, with the ablest professors of our country.

Now, in review, I beg leave to remark, that however people may differ in opinion as to the value of Professor Buchanan's labors, it has ever been admitted by his colleagues, as a body, that he is, as an acquisition to the school, too valuable to be dispensed with so long as he is retainable. Of the other three the class highly approve; now include with those the three, whom I know and highly appreciate, and all acting harmoniously together, and it becomes very questionable whether there is a school in our country more favorably circumstanced than the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati.

Gentlemen, I can not yet conclude—you must indulge me a few minutes longer. You are aware that there was a meeting of, so called, Eclectic physicians last winter in this city. It consisted of disaffected Eclectics, hood-winked Eclectics, and disaffected Physopaths—it was gotten up privately, there was

no call for it through the public press, it consisted of a few of such as I have designated, and their very *able, chaste and christian-like* proceedings were published in pamphlet form. Professor Jones was one of this meeting, and so was Ex-professor Baldridge. As I have said (with reference to Professor Jones) I have personally no unkind feelings towards Professor Baldridge; but as he has been intriguing to injure that organization upon which the principal weight or responsibility of medical reform, in this section of our country, rests, I can not forbear to expose him as one of the disaffected, who would brook or risk any mischief to the cause, to break down certain individuals of the organization above alluded to.

When I was seeking professors for the Memphis Institute, he desired to be one, and when I spoke of King, Newton and Freeman, he told me that they would not do, that King was not capable, Newton was not of the right *grit*, and Freeman could not be trusted, and consequently he would not serve with them; but he had, he said, two sons-in-law who were just the men for the occasion. Upon a subsequent occasion I informed him that I had decided upon accepting the services of those gentlemen, and, upon finding that my purpose was fixed, he consented to serve with them, but it so happened that *they* would not serve with *him*. But he was premature in all he did in this relation, for, at no time had I solicited his services. He was not what I wanted, and was too old to become it. It is proper to add, in this place, that before my acquaintance with him, he was hostile to Professor Buchanan, and to Jones also, I believe,

We now find that Ex-professors Jones and Baldridge were at the head of this secretly gotten up convention of *Eclectic (?)* physicians, and under all the circumstances connected with this subject can any one imagine it to be possible that opposition to the Institute, inculcated, hatched, and promoted by these gentlemen, can effect anything more than a public contempt for themselves? Gentlemen, I have more confidence in the wisdom of the public mind than to believe it.

There is, gentlemen, but one other topic upon which I desire to make a few remarks before concluding.

Ex-professor Jones has endeavored to make much capital out of the practice of the professors in delivering private lectures. He would have the public to believe that he is singularly honest in refusing to do so—that he taught all he knew in his public course. Upon this subject we can scarcely separate him from the idea of knavery or stupidity. I dislike the alternative and would not intentionally be harsh. If he delivers to a class all he knows in a course of four months lectures, why require students to take a second course, and even when they have done so occasionally reject them? If two courses will barely graduate a young man, would not three or four do it with far more credit to him? If Professor Jones can tell a class all that he knows in a four month's course of lectures, we should conclude that he was not prematurely removed. As regards the student, if the hearing of a subject discussed once will enlighten him, will he not become more enlightened and familiar with it by hearing it discussed several times?

The truth is, the giving of private lectures by the regular professors of medical colleges is, we may say, a universal practice, and as Professor Jones refuses to do it because of conscientious scruples, he should be regarded as the most honest professor who is known to the profession. We are confident that a capable teacher can advance a student more in one hour than books can in three days, and then, it is much more easy and agreeable. Upon this subject I am sure I have had more experience than Professor Jones, and therefore I recommend it to all students to take private lectures, if they can—the opinion of Professor Jones to the contrary notwithstanding."

After the conclusion of his remarks, the Chairman was requested by the members of the meeting to write them out in full for publication.

DR. WOMBAUGH addressed the meeting, expressing his earnest disapproba-

PROCEEDINGS OF ECLECTIC PHYSICIANS

tion of the recent attack upon the Institute, and offered the following resolutions :

" *Whereas* the labors of the faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute have been unfortunately opposed by the enemies of reform, and *Whereas*, we regret to learn that they have recently received the co-operation of additional slander and abusive reports from individuals unfriendly to the Institute,

" *Resolved*—That we consider it the duty of all true friends of reform to contradict and counteract the slanders which have recently been circulated by expelled professors.

" *Resolved*—That a committee of five be appointed to examine the subject in detail and make such a report to the medical profession as will promote the cause of truth and medical reform."

After remarks from various gentlemen, the foregoing resolutions were unanimously adopted, and the following gentlemen were a committee to carry out the purpose of the last resolution : Dr. W. Byrd Powell, Dr. Israel Wilson, Dr. P. K. Wombaugh, Dr. P. Henry Hale, and Dr. J. C. Thomas.

DR. S. KYLE made explanatory statements in reference to the so called "Meeting of Eclectic physicians," and denied having made the statements against Dr. Newton attributed to him in the pamphlet of Dr. Jones.

On motion, the Secretary proceeded to record the names of the gentlemen present who desired to have their names placed on record as members of the meeting approving of its proceedings, which names are those given above, as constituting the meeting.

On motion, *Resolved*, that the committee should be authorized to publish their report as the final action of this meeting.

On motion, the meeting adjourned.

W. BYRD POWELL, President.
P. HENRY HALE, Secretary.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

The committee appointed by the Eclectic Physicians of Cincinnati and Covington to report upon the recent accusations and hostile movements against the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, having examined the subject in a spirit of impartiality, and with an eye to the public welfare, apart from the private objects of individuals, would respectfully report—

That while they would regret any appearance of factious or discordant action, they do not deem the present occasion one of great importance or serious danger as to the consequences involved. At the same time, they believe that all abusive publications against the leading advocates of medical reform are calculated to give material aid to its opponents. They regret to observe that any individual, after occupying a place in the E. M. Institute, and after being required to withdraw by his colleagues or by the trustees, should be so provoked by personal disappointment as to assail his former colleagues, to endeavor to destroy the Institution, and to create a rancorous feud among the friends of reform. The personal differences between Dr. Jones and his former colleagues, and his decided personal hostility, constituted a sufficient reason for separation, but not for warfare against the school. The committee do not think that any private wrongs whatever would justify such a course. They would regret and condemn such action in any individual, whatever might be his

previous character or his personal injuries. Personal ends should not interfere with great public objects and institutions. Yet when grave charges against the Institute are adduced in a public manner, they demand some notice ; and as this is the purpose of our appointment, we propose to examine the question whether any charge can be substantiated which should diminish the esteem and admiration which the E. M. Institute has heretofore commanded.

If the charges of Dr. Jones and Dr. Baldridge are to be believed, the Eclectic Medical Institute is entirely unworthy of public confidence. The Faculty are, with scarcely an exception, unprincipled men, who are continually engaged in abusing each other secretly and plotting against each other's interests—but who have no hesitation in stating any falsehood necessary to keep up appearances. Not only are they void of honor, but they are equally void of good sense, disqualified for their position as medical teachers, destitute of the true spirit of reform, devoted to money and cunning in tricks to deceive and defraud their pupils in whose progress they feel no interest, and to whom they give very little satisfactory instruction.

Those who have known the past reputation of the Institute and of its Faculty, will be slow to believe such charges, and will require the best of evidence before they would believe that the world has been so totally mistaken in the character of a public institution and of its well-known Faculty. What, then, is the evidence upon which charges of so marvellous a character are based ? Very little evidence is adduced except the word of Dr. L. E. Jones and Dr. A. H. Baldridge. But these are interested witnesses, both highly incensed by being removed from office, and both anxious to establish, if possible, a rival school, but having no probable hopes of success except by the downfall of the E. M. Institute.

Still, if their statements appear to be candid, reasonable, and well-sustained, we must give them due credit. But that is the difficulty. The very first pointed accusation of Dr. Jones is in the form of an allusion to some disgraceful or immoral conduct of Dr. Buchanan, growing out of his relation as a student to Dr. Powell of this committee. Now the fact is he never held such a relation to that gentleman. If then imaginary or malicious stories are circulated without examination in one instance, with which we are acquainted, we can not rely upon other stories from the same imaginative and malicious source.

Next we observe a charge that Dr. Newton had been recently engaged in mercurial practice, and was, but the year before his appointment in the E. M. Institute, while professor in the Memphis Medical Institute, engaged in opposition to reform, having sanctioned a public announcement that the Memphis Institute was not reformatory in its character, but belonged entirely to the Old School Allopathic party. Upon this subject some of the committee have positive personal knowledge, other witnesses are within reach, who have given their testimony, and we feel it our duty to pronounce any such statement totally and maliciously untrue. We know that Dr. Newton has never abandoned the principles of Eclectic reform since he renounced the doctrines of his teachers and espoused the liberal cause. We know that the announcement in question was unauthorized and false, being, with its author, severely condemned by Dr. Newton and the majority of the Faculty. This whole subject was examined into and satisfactorily settled even to the approbation of Dr. Jones

himself, before Dr. Newton was appointed in the E. M. Institute. Why he should now attempt to revive slanders which he himself once despised and publicly denounced in the Eclectic Medical Journal, the reader can decide for himself. Another imputation which Dr. Jones attempts obliquely to revive is conveyed in an allusion to Dr. Newton as practicing with calomel. The committee would ask why, when a slander is dead and buried by common consent, should any one attempt to galvanize it into life. The Eclectic physicians of Cincinnati generally were charged with using mercury secretly, on account of their success in the cholera of 1849. This slander was nearly anonymous, but it was considered worthy of refutation by the unanimous declarations of all then in the city : that was the end of it. Dr. Newton was subsequently singled out for attack on the same score by Dr. Latta. The charge was completely answered at the time by Dr. Newton to the satisfaction of all Eclectics, in the Eclectic Medical Journal of October, 1849. The committee are led by these facts to conclude that if stale and exploded calumnies are introduced against Prof. N., it must be because no serious objections founded in truth can be adduced by his enemies.

It thus appears that in matters of which we have positive knowledge Dr. Jones not only disregards the truth but asserts the very opposite of truth. If so, we can not attach any importance to his other assertions, except so far as they are intrinsically reasonable or sustained by some other evidence.

Let us next enquire if the general statements of Dr. Baldridge can be relied upon as accurate, when judged by what the committee know to be true. One conspicuous statement of Dr. B. refers to the history of the E. M. Institute. He denies that he was removed from office or requested to resign, and affirms in substance that his resignation was entirely voluntary and in accordance with a previous intention. This the committee can not believe, as they are too familiar with the facts concerning Dr. B's removal. They must say that the removal was not voluntary on his part, and that Dr. B. as soon as removed was very anxious to procure a professorship somewhere else, as well as hostile to his late colleagues, for his rejection on account of incompetency. If then self-interest would lead Dr. Baldridge to pervert facts of such a nature, when there are so many individuals living who can correct his mis-statements, we do not feel that he is a reliable witness upon any subject in which his own interest or reputation is concerned. Especially when he is known as having for several years been hostile and abusive toward the E. M. Institute.

In addition to these two witnesses, who appear to be unreliable for correct information, statements are referred to as coming from various students of the Institute and various physicians in correspondence with Dr. Jones. To make these statements and scraps of letters worthy of confidence they must be fairly and honestly given. The committee can not possibly examine all of these cases and discover whether they are genuine or not, and whether they represent fairly the sentiments of the writers after a full view of the facts. They must judge from what they can learn of matters within reach.

They learn that a letter purporting to be signed by members of the medical class, which was one of the corroborating documents of Dr. Jones, has been respectfully called for by a committee of the last medical class, and that Dr. Jones could not be induced to exhibit it to that committee.

They learn that the name of Dr. E. E. Beach has been given by Dr. Jones in his pamphlet as authority for one of his statements, but they have also seen a statement from Dr. Beach flatly contradicting Dr. Jones and denying that he acknowledged any such statement.

They learn that an extract from a letter given by Dr. Jones in his first pamphlet, as from a graduate in Michigan, is not a correct representation, that gentleman's views being but a mere echo of Dr. J. Dr. J. succeeded in producing a prejudice against the rest of the Faculty in the mind of a student by whom this Michigan graduate was misled. The same student soon after discovered that he had been misled by untrue statements from Dr. J., and consequently gave different information to his friend in Michigan, and they both repudiate the sentiments which Dr. J. has published.

Dr. J. adduces the private conversations of different members of the Faculty, to prove that the Faculty is in a discordant condition, and that Dr. Buchanan and his views are not approved by his colleagues according to their public declarations—in short that they are all dishonest, and that Dr. B. is considered by them unsound. But unfortunately Dr. J.'s witnesses all turn against him. Every member of the present Faculty positively and solemnly denies all such imputations. That Dr. Buchanan has always maintained a high standing with his colleagues is sufficiently shown by their public acts and expressions and their reliance upon his services. The imputations of Dr. J., therefore, merely assail the integrity of said professors, by representing them as playing a deceitful part. But Dr. J. has not himself, at this time sufficient character for veracity to assail the veracity of others. He has, however, stated that Dr. Kyle made similar statements to his own concerning Dr. Newton's private conversations and that Dr. K. was willing to swear to their truth. But the committee find that Dr. K. does not sustain him. Dr. K. was present at the *true* meeting of Eclectic Physicians at the E. M. Institute, and then publicly and distinctly contradicted this version of his remarks. The committee also have in their possession a letter addressed to them by Dr. K. on this subject, in which he states that he has not observed, in attending lectures at the Institute, the evils complained of by Dr. J., and denies making any such statement as Dr. Jones has placed in his mouth. Ex-professor L. G. Jones, of Columbus, also denies the correctness of the statements of L. E. Jones as refers to his own conversations, (see Eclectic Medical Journal for March,) and Dr. Morrow has left his own sentiments on record in the Eclectic Medical Journal. Being now dead he can not speak, but his most intimate associate and brother-in-law, Prof. Hill states in his behalf (in a letter which we have seen) that in his private conversation he often expressed his approbation of Dr. Buchanan's private course of lectures and never expressed any disapprobation to his knowledge.

Thus far Dr. Jones' statements being unsound, and his stories contradicted by his own witnesses, let us enquire what additional testimony can be adduced. We find several extracts from letters, published, some with and some without a name. The committee have enquired as to the sources of these letters and statements. They find that some of the parties have been disappointed in procuring a medical degree, some have been disappointed aspirants to professorships—some have been considered as reflecting no credit upon the profession, and some are hostile to the

Institute and its doctrines. Where they emanate from respectable sources they are probably based upon *exparte* statements, and not the product of a deliberate opinion and full knowledge of the facts. Hence the committee can not regard such statements as of any value.

As to the attempts of Dr. Jones to impeach the general talent, soundness of judgment, and professional knowledge of Dr. Buchanan and his colleagues, the committee do not think that those gentlemen stand in any need of defence. It would be a work of supererogation to attempt to prove what is so well known by the public. As to the public and private lectures and peculiar views or discoveries of Dr. B. they have long been regarded as constituting attractive and valuable features of the Institute, and expressions of disapprobation from individual students amount to nothing when the general expression of classes has been so uniformly that of extreme approbation and interest, and when the national reputation of Dr. B. has been mainly acquired by means of those very doctrines. The attacks upon Dr. Buchanan and Dr. King have both been refuted by the decided expression of their classes.

The attacks upon the Clinical course and hospital called Newton's Clinical Institute, are, in the judgment of the committee, simply malicious, as they are contrary to the sentiments of all the students who attended. An anonymous attack upon the Hospital clinic during the last course, (the source of which is not positively known,) elicited the following expression from all the students who voluntarily attended the exercises.

SENTIMENTS OF THE CLINICAL CLASS.

Whereas, we, the members of the clinic class, feel ourselves implicated by the letter received by Professor R. S. Newton, over the signature of "Tatler's Devil," purporting to express the sentiments of said class, *Resolved*

1st. That we deprecate the act and the author.

2nd. That we are not only satisfied, but think Prof. Newton has done all that it was possible for him to do under the circumstances, and that we hereby tender him our thanks for the deep interest he has taken in our behalf and to render the clinic lectures instructive.

T. J. Fentress,	J. A. Burns,	Wm. North Wilkerson,
J. Turrentine,	J. R. Johnson,	Isaac A. Hammer,
A. B. Nobles,	J. H. Gray,	D T. Holland,
Jos. H. Ing,	J. W. Adams,	Van McHenry,
David Hulse,	John Hull,	M. H. Dersham,
M. N. Bonebrake,	C. W. Stocum,	W. W. Washburn,
S. B. Anderson,	Jno. H. Ogden,	G. F. Bailey,
James Crowfoot,	H. H. Lewis,	J. Shotwell,
J. S. Bebee,	John C. Nisbet,	Geo. L. Gibbs,
A. C. Hewett,	C. Stowell,	M Francis Clayton,
Roland T. Hart,	Anson Birch,	M. M. Baily,
Wm. W. McCullough,	J. T. Lattner,	Wm. S. Latta,
E. Williams,	J. A. Churchill,	Henry Vigor,
Enoch P. Jones,	H. R. Benham,	Wm. Patty,
Jas. C. Heyderson,	J. M. Swift,	Eli Elstun,
A. Beck,	J. F. Wuist,	Isaac Tibbets,
M. R. Leonard,	T. F. Steward,	A. H. Cropper,
E. H. Lake,	Andrew Gullett,	Thos. Cuscaden.

Is it necessary to protract any further our review? We have not yet found the evidence that the Institute and Faculty are in any degree liable to the charges of Dr. Jones, and even if we had any evidence of their truth, we should have great difficulty in believing them, since it would be necessary to believe that sixty or seventy respectable physicians, recent

graduates of the Institute, have united in publishing unprincipled falsehoods. There is a question of veracity between Dr. J. and the medical classes of both the Winter and the Spring sessions, and it is easier to suppose that one interested and impassioned individual may mis-state the facts in his own case, than that so large a number of disinterested parties should state such falsehoods. We here append the proceedings of the class which attended the Winter session, who had heard Dr. Jones as a professor and had also heard his whole argument and his attack upon the Faculty. These proceedings, we learn, were the sentiments of the entire class within a few days of the close of the session. One hundred and twenty-eight were counted in the hall of the Institute, of whom but two were opposed to adopting the resolutions. We presume the members of these classes to have been as respectable as other classes in respectable schools, and we regard those whom we know personally as gentlemen of integrity.

PROCEEDINGS OF WINTER AND SPRING CLASSES.

ECLECTIC MEDICAL HALL, Cincinnati, February 17, 1853.

At a meeting of the class of the E. M. Institute, GEO. LUNDY GIBBS was called to the Chair, and E. H. WAUGH appointed Secretary. On motion, a committee of five was appointed to draft resolutions expressing the views of the class regarding a publication recently made, purporting to be a report of the proceedings of Eclectic Physicians held in Cincinnati, February 7, 1853, and signed by A. H. Baldridge, M. D., President, and S. Kyle, M. D., Secretary.

The following gentlemen were appointed said committee : B. Pickering, T. R. Ward, W. S. Severance, T. C. Ellis. The meeting then adjourned until to-morrow, February 18.

February 18, 1853. The class met pursuant to adjournment. The committee presented the following report, which was adopted.

E. H. WAUGH, M. D., SECRETARY. G. L. GIBBS, PRESIDENT.

WHEREAS, we have carefully read a pamphlet against the Eclectic Medical Institute, recently put forth by Dr. L. E. Jones, signed by A. H. Baldridge, M. D., President, and S. Kyle, M. D., Secretary, purporting to represent the sentiments of the Eclectic Physicians of Cincinnati and vicinity ; and whereas, we know of but one Eclectic physician entertaining such sentiments, excepting the two whose names are signed to the pamphlet:

1st. *Resolved*, That we regard this pamphlet as an imposition on the public whom it addresses under the false pretence of expressing the sentiments of the Eclectic physicians of Cincinnati and vicinity, when in reality it only expresses the ideas and language of Dr. L. E. Jones, which are prompted solely by the desire to inflict injury upon the most successful, talented, and efficient school of medical reform now in existence.

2nd. *Resolved*, That the entire pamphlet is filled with a series of slanderous misrepresentations, which render it entirely unworthy of pub-

lic confidence, and prove that its author has but little regard to the claims of truth and honor.

3d. *Resolved*, That the assertion that the class *generally* sympathize with L. E. Jones, and approve his course, is a slander upon the class.

4th. *Resolved*, That the assertion that seventy or eighty students left the Institute on account of the expulsion of Dr. L. E. Jones, and the "inefficient teachings of the Faculty," is grossly false, as it is well known to the entire class that the number of students in attendance upon the lectures immediately after the expulsion of Dr. Jones instead of being diminished was actually *greater* than it was immediately previous to that act.

5th. *Resolved*, That we feel assured, and that many of the present class positively know from their own attendance, that the doctrinal teachings of the E. M. Institute are in substance and spirit the same at present that they have been from the first organization of the school, and that the assertions of Dr. L. E. Jones to the contrary, are the mere offspring of chagrin and disappointed ambition.

6th. *Resolved*, That the imputations of chicanery and fraud against the present Faculty are utterly groundless, and are disgraceful only to the slanderer who utters the ridiculous charge.

7th. *Resolved*, That the expulsion of Dr. L. E. Jones was an act of necessity, for the preservation of the Institute, and that the assertion that he was expelled on account of his opposition to Homœopathy, is a falsehood so totally groundless as to prove its author capable of fabricating falsehoods without a scruple.

8th. *Resolved*, That when the announcement was made that Dr. L. E. Jones had been expelled from the Institution—that the class received the announcement with "sadness and silence," "with surprise and mortification," by the members of the class in general, is very far from truth; the truth being that the announcement was received and applauded with unusual interest, as the class knew that he could not longer remain in his chair and harmony prevail in the Institution.

9th. *Resolved*, That the reiterated statement that numbers of the class have been *compelled* to attend private courses of lectures, and further, that the lectures have been deficient in the Institute in consequence of said courses of lectures, is unqualifiedly false; the lectures on the contrary having been full and complete, and entire satisfaction has been given.

10th. *Resolved*, That the unanimous action of the Faculty in expelling Dr. L. E. Jones has resulted in harmony and good feeling in the Institute, which did not and could not have prevailed so long as he was permitted to indulge in a tirade of personal abuse of the professors, and indulge in vulgarity which was unbefitting a gentleman, much less a man whose greatest interest is for the "unsuspecting and too confiding youth" of the E. M. Institute.

11th. *Resolved*, That we regard Professor Bickley, not only as a good lecturer, but as an efficient and instructive teacher, and that he has the esteem and confidence of the class.

12th. *Resolved*, That we can not too strongly disapprove of the thrusts made at Professor Buchanan, which deserve a prompt condemnation of all favorable to the cause of Eclecticism, as he has done more than any

other individual, excepting the lamented Professor Morrow, to forward the cause, and as much depends on him as the able and devoted supporter of Eclecticism, such slanderous attacks can not too promptly meet the disapprobation of all true Eclectics.

13th. *Resolved*, That the E. M. Institute was never in a more prosperous condition, never more harmonious, never on a firmer basis, never were the teachings more thorough and satisfactory, never before were the future prospects more cheering and hopeful than now.

14th. *Resolved*, That the assertion of Dr. L. E. Jones, that he was expelled because he opposed the doctrines of Hahnemann, is utterly false and groundless, as the subject of Homœopathy, so far as we know, was never a matter of discussion or difference between the members of the Faculty, and he was never, as far as we know, censured or opposed by any one for the views which he expressed on the subject. In all the charges against him we have never heard the subject of Homœopathy even alluded to, although we have heard many other charges against him of a very serious character.

15th. *Resolved*, That the assertion, that the Faculty of the E. M. Institute are departing from the plain, practical course of teaching, which has heretofore been pursued in the Institute in the time of Dr. Morrow, and that the Faculty have become partly Homœopathic and partly Allopathic or "Old School," is a slanderous falsehood, which is not only entirely groundless, but is certainly the very reverse of truth; since in the time of Dr. Morrow the Faculty embraced one member of the Old School Allopathic party, and one member of the Homœopathic party; whereas at this time there are no such encumbrances upon the school; and the whole course of teaching in the Institution is solid, practical, and truly Eclectic, as that term has always been understood by the great mass of medical reformers in America.

16th. *Resolved*, That the assertion that the teachings of Prof. Buchanan are ethereal, wild, incoherent, and visionary fancies, and that they are calculated to subject the graduates and students to "unmerited reproaches and contumely," we feel it our duty to deny, as we have heard from the chair which he occupies nothing but a clear and simple explanation of the physiological and pathological subjects which belong to his department presented in a peculiarly original manner, and embracing much important and practical matter, not obtainable from any work with which we are acquainted, or taught in any other medical school of which we have any knowledge.

17th. *Resolved*, That those who have become acquainted with his wonderful accessions to science do universally accept his teachings as supplying a great vacuum in science, that they are in perfect accordance, as we most firmly believe, with the great laws controlling the animal organism, and that his discoveries in physiological science have rendered parts of the science, heretofore obscure and mystified, clear and plain as any fact in science.

BARTON PICKERING, THOS. R. WARD, W. S. SEVERANCE, T. C. ELLIS, GEORGE KELLER,	}	Committee.
---	---	------------

ECLECTIC MEDICAL INSTITUTE, June 8, 1853.

At a meeting of the class of the Eclectic Medical Institute, for the purpose of taking into consideration the contents of a pamphlet, said to be published by Dr. L. E. Jones, H. Doty was called to the chair, and T. J. Fentress appointed Secretary.

On motion, a committee of three was appointed, consisting of the following gentlemen : Messrs. Fentress, Johnson, and Benham, to wait on Dr. L. E. Jones and obtain, if possible, a copy of a letter, which he asserts to be in his possession, purporting to have been written in New York city.

[This letter was stated by Dr. J. to have been written in Cincinnati, and signed by several students, as an expression of approbation toward himself, although it was published as a letter from New York, in order to conceal all the parties concerned in this clandestine transaction.—Ed.]

On motion, a committee of five was appointed, consisting of the following gentlemen : Messrs. Johnson, Turrentine, Hewett, Finkbine, and Benham, to draft resolutions expressing the views of the class concerning the above-mentioned pamphlet.

On motion, the meeting adjourned to meet to-morrow, at 4 o'clock, P. M.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

June 9th, 1853.

We, the said committee, proceeded according to instructions, and politely requested Dr. L. E. Jones to furnish us with a copy of said letter, which he positively refused, stating that he was under no obligations whatever to accede to our request ; his assertions to the contrary, notwithstanding.

T. J. FENTRESS,	}
J. R. JOHNSON,	
H. R. BENHAM,	

Committee.

On motion, each resolution, as follows, was taken up separately and unanimously adopted.

On motion, it was *Resolved*, That these resolutions with the proceedings of the meeting, be forwarded to Prof. R. S. Newton for publication.

T. J. FENTRESS, Secretary.

H. DOTY, Chairman.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE CLASS.

Whereas, Certain reports are in circulation, derogatory to the character and position of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, and reflecting dishonor upon the class now in attendance ; and Whereas, a part of a pamphlet, entitled "An exposition of the professional perfidy, hypocrisy, duplicity and mendacity of the secret and malicious intriguer, Prof. J. R. Buchanan," and which would, ere this, have been published in full, had not the design and scurrility of the article prevented its issue, containing as it does, gross falsehoods and base insinuations, alike insulting to Prof. Buchanan and his associates, and degrading to the author ; therefore,

Resolved, That we regard this movement, on the part of those engaged in it, as a treacherous attack upon the cause of reform, dictated by a

feeling of chagrin, wounded pride, and revenge—as vindictive as false, and infamous as untrue.

Resolved, That we regard the assertion, that “the desire for diplomas, and the fear of displeasing their Faculty, especially after so many tirades of abuse had been hurled at me by them, forced the class into submission, or at least into silence,” as a *slander*, reflecting dishonor upon the independence of the graduating class to whom it refers; and false, as members of the Spring class, then in attendance, will testify; and that no “tirades of abuse,” or “threats” were uttered in the Institute.

Resolved, That the assertion that “many of the students who remained during the vacation would not matriculate in the Eclectic Medical Institute, for the Spring session, until they came to me and learned that the new school (?) would not be organized this spring,” is unequivocally false, as the members of the class unanimously testify.

Resolved, That the assertion that “only about sixty remained in the city, nearly fifty of whom were candidates for graduation, and of that number but a few, probably not more than twenty, voted for their adoption,” etc., is *false*, as the chairman and others of the meeting which adopted these resolutions *well know*.

Resolved, That the statement concerning “various emphatic, printed documents coming from the class after it was reduced to less than one-third,” is unmeaning and untrue, because, first, no “printed document” came from the class referred to, and second, no such “reduction” took place.

Resolved, That the assertions that Prof. Buchanan is a “poor teacher, capable of selecting and impressing but little of any importance”—that he is hard to understand, wild and visionary,” are grossly unjust, reflecting dishonor on one of the best physiologists of the age, and if regarded would be detrimental to the progress of physiological science; and that, though his indefatigable labors and lofty deductions may not be appreciated by hunkers, nor understood by the stupid, we highly appreciate them, and regard his lectures as all that could be asked by the students of physiology.

Resolved, That the insinuation that “Prof. B. condenses his lectures into one-half of the term, and then so mystifies and commingles them with intangibles as to render progress impossible,” is wholly unfounded; and that while he necessarily gave his chair, for the first half of his term, to Anatomy, he has fully made up his time in the latter half; and that we regard his instructions as the more impressive from that arrangement; and that the assertion that he brings all his peculiar views into his regular course on physiology, has no foundation in truth; and that when he delivered a few lectures, at the close of the session, on the science of Anthropology, it was by *especial request of the class*.

Resolved, That the statement in said pamphlet charging Prof. B. with “teaching homœopathy,” is known by this class to be *untrue*, as his views of those doctrines has been so distinctly stated, and his sound Eclectic teachings so practical, and highly prized, that we indignantly spurn the insinuation, and cast it back upon its authors.

[It is not implied here that homœopathic instruction or practice is dis-honorable in itself—the charge which is thus spurned is that of duplicity, in teaching doctrines contrary to publicly expressed belief.—ED.]

Resolved, That the insinuations in said part of pamphlet, charging members of the Faculty with "fraud, swindling," etc., are but the emanations of a brain diseased by jealousy and envy, and are as false as malicious, as the private lectures of Professors Buchanan and King were delivered in compliance with the earnest solicitations of the several classes; and the small fee charged for such lectures was freely given, and in no instance urged from the members of those classes.

Resolved, That so far as concerns the charge against Prof. King, that "he only recommended six or eight remedies," falsehood marks it; for in his lectures to the class, he has recommended over one hundred remedies; and we regard him as one of the best practitioners of the age; and that the charge that he has reserved any disease legitimately belonging to his chair, for his private course, is utterly *untrue*.

Resolved, That we, as members of previous classes, as well as those now in attendance, wish to express our pleasure that the recent change in the members of the Faculty has been made, thus placing in the chair of practice, in the place of Ex-professor Jones, a man infinitely his superior in *amiability*, in scientific attainments, and in success as a practitioner in the treatment of diseases which have baffled the skill of other schools of medicine.

Resolved, Finally, that despite all the contumely that has been hurled against the Faculty and the Institute, we regard the Faculty as purely Eclectic, high-minded and honorable gentlemen, efficient and zealous teachers, faithful to the interests of Eclecticism and of the glorious cause of medical reform, lovers of science, and friends of humanity; and that the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, Ohio, is the grand nucleus around which cluster the strength and the glory of American medical reform; and despite all opposition, it will stand as firm and unshaken as the rock of Gibraltar, and continue to shine until it has illuminated the medical world, that is now shrouded in darkness; and that we are proud to acknowledge her as our Alma Mater, and hereby pledge ourselves to sustain and promote her interests to the utmost of our ability.

J. R. JOHNSON, J. TURRENTINE, A. C. HEWETT, WILLIAM FINKBINE, H. R. BENHAM.	}	<i>Committee.</i>
---	---	-------------------

Thus while all the reliable testimony refutes the attacks of Drs. Jones and Baldridge, we may ask whether such attacks have any importance? * They appear to derive importance from two facts. 1st, These gentlemen have heretofore been recognized as professors in the Institute. 2nd, Their accusations are represented as endorsed by a "NUMEROUS" meeting of "Eclectic physicians," and Dr. Jones professes to have received universal sympathy with his views.

* The committee would remark that they have made no reference to a number of abusive statements in the pamphlet in question, for the reason that, although they are known to be untrue, they are of too paltry a character to be dignified by any especial notice or formal contradiction. They would remark, however, that the malicious reference to Dr. Buchanan in connexion with the death of Dr. Morrow, is not sustained by the statement of the facts which we have received from the best authority.

As to the former fact we would remark that no member of the present Faculty or present Board of Trustees was concerned in their introduction into the Institute, excepting Dr. Wilson who concurred in their removal. They were appointed because there was no competition for the places and the Board was compelled to accept a sufficient number to make out a Faculty. Dr. Jones was chosen as a substitute for Dr. Jordan who would not accept. Both of these gentlemen retained their places until their presence was found to be deeply injurious to the Institute, in the *unanimous opinion of their colleagues*.

As to the "numerous" meeting of Eclectic physicians, the committee can not discover its existence. The only general meeting of which we have any knowledge was that publicly called and held at the E. M. Institute, by which the present committee were appointed. In the private meeting at Dr. Jones' apartments, there were three or four known as physicians in Eclectic practice, one of whom was present at our public meeting, and we have never heard that any of these individuals approved of Dr. Jones' scurrilous language against the Faculty, on the contrary, we have been informed by Dr. Kyle that the scurrilous expressions of the pamphlet were inserted after the meeting by Dr. Jones himself.

As to the great sympathy Dr. J. has received we have only his own statement, upon which we can not rely, as he professes to have received a great deal of sympathy from the class when they have almost unanimously condemned him, and has endeavored to convince the public that the physicians of Cincinnati unanimously condemned the Institute, which is the reverse of the truth. If his claims to sympathy abroad are no better grounded than his claims to sympathy at home, his opposition to Institute need not excite much apprehension.

Upon the whole the committee regard this entire affair as amounting to very little more than an effort of interested parties to create dissatisfaction and undermine the leading school and principal reliance of medical reform, with the hope of preparing for the establishment of an opposition school, which is not needed, and which would be productive of much injury—aside from the ingratitude of endeavoring to injure and thwart the labors of those who have so nobly upheld the banner of reform. The present Faculty deserve the united and hearty support of every friend of reform, and as their labors receive but little pecuniary recompense, while they are diffusing the principles of reform more efficiently and extensively than has ever been done before, they are doubly entitled to the gratitude and friendship, and the co-operation of all who desire the success of reformatory principles.

From all that we can learn, the school at present does not comprise a single inefficient or unfaithful teacher, nor a single one who is not esteemed and respected by the class. Nor do we believe that a more harmonious and co-operative Faculty was ever united in one institution. Certainly the Institute has never before been so free from discordant elements and from any doctrines or influences adverse to liberal and progressive reform, in the spirit in which the Institute was originally founded.

As to the attempt to insinuate that the Institute neglects giving the proper instruction in Eclectic practice, and to a great extent teaches the Homoeopathic system, which is implied in the pamphlet of Dr. Jones, we scarcely know whether such ideas deserve to be treated even seriously.

Every one concerned knows that the instruction in the Institute has always been in all departments what is denominated Eclectic, except while the chair of Homœopathy was established in the Institute. In the establishment of this chair, by a former Faculty, no member of the present Faculty had any agency except Dr. Buchanan. The leading part in its establishment was taken by Dr. Hill and Dr. Morrow. The extent to which the Faculty went at that time was objected to by Dr. Buchanan—and the first movement for its discontinuance was made by Dr. B., through whose action finally the chair was abolished, in which movement he was sustained by the influence of the present professor of practice.

During the lifetime of Dr. Morrow he firmly maintained the Homœopathic department against objections adduced by some of the present Faculty. And it is notorious that the Institute has, at the present time, less connexion with the Homœopathic party than at any former period. Not one of those who gave an unqualified support to the Homœopathic chair is now in the Faculty.

Excepting as to the excision of the Homœopathic department, the identity of the Institute in spirit and sentiment with its original principles, has been remarkably preserved. The same member of the original Faculty, upon whom devolved from the first the duty of defining the doctrines and platform of the school, is still vigilant as Dean of the Faculty in maintaining a liberal and consistent course and in teaching the same Eclectic philosophy in medicine. The two leading pioneers who were removed by disease and death from the chair of practice have been replaced by one who, although younger, has already gained the most conspicuous position in the Eclectic ranks as practitioner and surgeon. The chair of obstetrics has been occupied by one of the oldest and ablest Eclectic physicians in America; three of the chairs, vacated by resignation for other pursuits, have been filled by well qualified professors who are graduates of the Institute, and who have established the character of sound, thorough, fluent and efficient teachers. We are therefore convinced that the Institute was never in a better condition for sound Eclectic teaching and for harmonious action. The course of clinical instruction has supplied a great desideratum, and notwithstanding the active intrigues against the Institute, we believe it has never enjoyed greater, if even as great, reputation and popularity as at the present time.

W. BYRD POWELL,
ISRAEL WILSON,
P. HENRY HALE,
P. K. WOMBAUGH,
J. C. THOMAS. } Committee.

DR. BUCHANAN TO THE MEDICAL PUBLIC.

It is with feelings of pity for a passionate and misguided individual, as well as disgust for the vulgar ebullition of his malice, that I now refer, as briefly as possible, to the last calumnious pamphlet of Dr. L. E. Jones. Among those acquainted with the parties and the facts, no such reference is necessary, and silence would be the proper course; but there are so many to whom the facts, as well as the parties, are but little known, that a brief explanation is necessary, if for no other purpose, at least, to furnish the friends of medical reform with the necessary information to repel the attacks of the combined enemies of liberal medicine,—composed of the inveterate enemies of all reform, and the demagogues, traitors, and pretenders, who co-operate with them. Let me proceed, then, to correct this budget of malicious falsehood, and petty misstatement, so far as self-respect permits the notice of its malevolent gossip. And I trust it will be the last time I shall ever allude to this individual and his attacks.

Dr. Jones, although not fully conscious of the degradation of his position, having been condemned as a wilful slanderer, by medical classes, endeavors to break the force of their sentence of condemnation

by denying the fact that such condemnation was general and decided, yet in this subterfuge, affirming that not more than about twenty voted for his condemnation, he but aggravates his disgrace, by stating a palpable falsehood, which has been unanimously pronounced false by the class in attendance at the Spring session. Surely his reputation for truth must have been entirely annihilated, when, out of 125 or 130 gentlemen, composed of his former auditors, many of whom had been upon the most friendly terms personally, there were not even five individuals who would refuse to pronounce him a convicted slanderer.

The other subterfuge of intimating that the resolutions of the Winter class proceeded from myself, is entirely unavailing. Even if it had been true that my assistance was considered desirable or necessary, to regulate judiciously the phraseology of their sentiments, the fact would have amounted to nothing,—being an indication of their prudence, and a desire to avoid injudicious remarks, or unnecessarily harsh expressions. But, the truth was, the committee drew up their resolutions before consulting me upon the subject, and when they called upon me for additional suggestions, I gave them my views, which appeared to coincide with their own, and they completed their expression according to their own views, which were considered, discussed, and adopted by the class, because they were the clear expression of the common sentiment. The expression was truly the spontaneous sentiment of the entire class, and would have been equally if not more severe in sentiment, if no suggestion had been made by myself. The resolutions unanimously adopted by the Spring class, of which I had no knowledge until a week after the class had dispersed, are certainly as pithy and energetic in their condemnation of Dr. J. as those that were adopted during the Winter; his scurrilous pamphlet being pronounced, not only untrue, but "infamous."

Why, then, it may be asked, should slanders, so generally condemned as infamous, be noticed at all? Simply for the reason that this collection of slanders, will probably be the principal magazine from which the enemies or medical reform will supply themselves with weapons, for their partisan warfare against our cause. All the Old School medical journals of America combined, and all the malignity of Old School colleges, have never evolved, in all their operations, one-fourth of the amount of calumnious misrepresentation which has been set afloat by a single traitor to the cause. Every Eclectic physician, when using his moral influence in his own circle for the benefit of reform, to divert young men from the associations of a medical despotism to those of Eclectic reform, will find the most active influence brought against him; from the slanders of Dr. Jones, eagerly repeated and circulated, for the support of the merciful system.

The amount of injury which might be done in this way, if such slanders were credited, is ten fold greater than all the service which has ever been rendered by Dr. J. to reform, and it can be counteracted efficiently only by placing Eclectic physicians in full possession of the facts.

Dr. Jones makes an industrious effort to falsify my relations to Dr. Morrow. His assertion, that "Dr. Morrow absolutely required him to omit two or three pages" of allusion to Neurological science, in the circular, and all other assertions which represent Dr. Buchanan or Dr. Morrow as speaking disrespectfully of each other, are the mere offspring of malice. I was never aware of any differences of sentiment between Dr. Morrow and myself, as to what would be a proper allusion to cerebral science in the circulars of the school. The friendly and intimate relations between Dr. Morrow and myself, were never interrupted for an hour or a moment,—and I can not but regret that he is not living to utter the indignant rebuke with which he would respond to the dishonorable references to himself and his friend. To represent Dr. M. as practicing systematic duplicity toward myself, to keep my co-operation with the school, and being afraid to utter his sentiments, is a base slander on his memory.

Had Dr. M. been alive, he would have borne the principal burden of the removal of Dr. Jones, as he did in the case of Dr. Baldridge. The very climax of hypocritical impudence is exhibited in the crocodile sympathy which these men now exhibit toward the memory of Dr. Morrow—one of whom stood in hostile relations to him, during the life of Dr. M., while the other was continually harrassed by his jealousy of Dr. Morrow's course, and was only withheld by his fears from making the most serious charges.

These are unpleasant subjects, and I should not make any allusion to them, but for the unbounded impudence of a man who never enjoyed the intimacy or the confidence of Dr. M.—whose views differed so widely upon many subjects—who was prevented from an open rupture merely by the fact that he was over-awed, but who now claims an intimacy and sympathy which never existed, merely to aid his struggles for revenge.

The reference to Professor Hill, as participating in the disapprobation of my course, is equally unwarrantable and untrue, as is shown by a letter from Prof. H. upon this subject, which is at the service of any who wish to see it.

The treacherous attempt of Dr. J. to array against me private conversations of members of the faculty, has only resulted in his own disgrace, as in every solitary instance his assertions are solemnly denied by all concerned; and several have informed me, that the language which Dr. J. has attempted to father upon them, is the very identical language which he was himself accustomed to use.

Honorable men do not betray the confidence of private conversation; hence I was never informed by my friends of the malicious language of Dr. J.; but he who, not satisfied with this species of treachery, totally distorts and falsifies private conversations, maliciously reported, forfeits all claims to credibility. (See statements of Prof. I. G. Jones, Prof. R. S. Newton, Prof. W. Sherwood, Prof. J. King, Prof. G. W. L. Bickley, Prof. J. W. Hoyt, in Eclectic Medical Journal of March, 1853. The committee of Eclectic Physicians have further examined the same subject.)

The reference to Neurology as gradually acquiring an increasing power in the Institute, is entirely false. It occupied the same position in the school at the first as it has ever done, since my labors in that field of science were the means, in the first instance, of inducing the authorities of the school to invite my co-operation.

The relations which I have borne to Homœopathy, and the sentiments which I have expressed have been zealously distorted and falsified. To accuse a medical man of favoring or adopting Homœopathy is not a criminal or discreditible charge, for any scientific system, honorably pursued, is honorable to its followers, but in this matter I repel accusations which derive their whole character from the attempt to attribute double-dealing and insincerity.

My relations to Homœopathy have been the same from the first, without any variation, to the present time. Almost identical in sentiment with my colleague, Dr. Morrow, (though slightly different in policy,) I have no disposition now to modify the sentiments which my conscience approved, and which were so firmly sustained by him. I have ever vindicated, and ever expect to vindicate, Homœopathy as a system of reform, against the unjust attacks of its orthodox and bigoted opponents—but while I

vindicate its claim to an honorable position as a contribution to medical science and medical reform, I claim the right, when confronted with over-zealous, ultra or bigoted supporters of that system, to criticise, either by reason or by ridicule, the extravagance of their assumptions. But I have no sympathy whatever with the course of an expelled professor, who could regard Homœopathy as a system of delusion, and yet, from a short-sighted policy, fraternize with it and assist in giving it diffusion until convinced that his policy was unprofitable, he became its most zealous opponent, denouncing others who could not shift with so much rapidity. To illustrate my position, I must refer to the fact that, while I have always urged a liberal treatment of Homœopathy, I never regarded the course adopted in the establishment of the Homœopathic chair, as a measure of prudence. I am not accustomed to dwelling on my own acts and preserving exact reminiscences of the part I may have borne in public transactions. But in reference to this matter, it is impressed on my mind by the fact that I received from a prominent Homœopathic practitioner (when negotiating concerning the Homœopathic chair) a letter containing a pungent rebuke for not being sufficiently liberal in my course toward Homœopathy. If my sentiments had been favorable to that movement, it would certainly have been known to my Homœopathic friends. Hence I have requested of Professor Gatchell, of the Cleveland school, (then a professor in the Institute) with whom I was especially intimate, to state what were his recollections of the sentiments which I expressed at that time. Prof. G. says—(in a letter, which is at the service of any who w sh to see it.)

"I well recollect the conversation held by us, relative to the establishment of that chair, and that you expressed yourself as decidedly opposed to it. You proposed simply to open the hall of the Institute to any Homœopathist who might be selected by the fraternity to lecture there—but from first to last you opposed the creation of a Homœopathic chair as one of the chairs of the Institute. After one year's trial of the chair you offered, for at least sustained, (I do not certainly recollect which) a resolution at a faculty meeting, recommending an abolition of the chair.

"After Dr. Morrow's death, yourself and myself being the only members of the Faculty in the city, and yourself a member of the Board of Trustees, you, as I was always informed, proposed, advocated and carried a resolution abolishing the chair."

To this abolition of the chair Dr. Morrow and others were decidedly opposed, when the measure was brought forward by myself in the faculty meeting, and the proposition was rejected; subsequently I have been informed by Professor Newton that, in his last conversation with Professor Morrow before his death, when he urged his objections against the Homœopathic chair, Dr. Morrow resisted his suggestions and expressed a confidence in his ability to sustain that department. It was, therefore, not by myself, but by the majority of the faculty, that the Homœopathic department was introduced,—and not by the faculty generally, but myself, that its abolition was proposed and effected, for no such design was entertained until the death of Dr. Morrow threw the responsibility upon myself and enabled me to take that decisive course.

Between the death of Dr. Morrow and the abolition of the Homœopathic chair, Professors Hill, Rosa and Jones held a meeting in reference to the affairs of the Institute, at Elyria, O., the result of which was communicated by Prof. Hill, and some of the suggestions were carried out. At this meeting instead of recommending the abolition of the Homœopathic chair, there was no objection or disapprobation expressed—on the contrary it was recommended that the Homœopathic professor should perform the additional duties of Professor of Obstetrics—a proposition so ruinous in its tendency that I at once rejected it, and Prof. Gatchell agreed with me that its effect would be suicidal to the Institute. Yet about a week or two afterwards Dr. J. gave me his proxy to act in the Board of Trustees, when I procured the abolition of that chair.

The ridiculous assertions that I proposed to convert the Institute into a Homœopathic school located in Covington, and to enter into Homœopathic practice myself, are so STUPIDLY absurd that one may divide his admiration between the malicious profligacy of such falsehoods, and the silly stupidity which would attempt to give them currency.

The quotations made by Dr. J. from the most extreme passages in which I have illustrated on the one hand the merits, and on the other hand the defects of Homœopathy and infinitesimals, are made in the same spirit of cunning and malice. A passage, designed to illustrate the increasing impressibility of mankind, is quoted without reference to the page from which it is taken, and remarks are separated from the context and construed into a meaning the very reverse of the truth. The paragraph thus distorted, which occurs on page 239 of the first volume of Buchanan's Journal of Man, denounces, as useless and injurious, the bleeding and drastic medication of the old schoolsystem, and recommends instead "*the gentler agents of the materia medica*"—viz.: those which are used by Eclectic reformers, which are considered milder and safer than calomel, antimony, etc. In addition to those, still gentler agents were shown to be useful on account of the *high impressibility* of many constitutions. Where such impressibility exists, the homœopathic preparations, animal magnetism, etc. are sufficient, without any material quantity of medicine. These ideas, which have been, from the first, promulgated, without objection, through the Institute and through the Eclectic Journal, Dr. J. caricatures into the proposition that the Eclectic remedies should be discarded as useless, and animal magnetism and homœopathy substituted. Such disregard of truth shows that Dr. J., having lost character with those who understood the facts, and hopeless of reaching *them*, aims mainly to reach those who know nothing of the Institute, and the character or doctrines of its faculty, and are therefore liable to imposition, and to furnish materials for enemies of reform who may be as unscrupulous as himself.

Assailing, as Dr. J. does, a Faculty of whom he has personally endorsed and commended every member (excepting Dr. Sherwood and Dr. Bickley,) as sound Eclectic teachers, he is certainly aware of the entire falsehood and malice of his attacks, and it is amusing to observe that, in order to escape the force of his published commendation of Dr. King, he falsifies his own language and declares that his commendation applied to Dr. Hill, although when his letter was published Dr. Hill had accepted a Homœopathic professorship, previous to which his sentiments were well known, and his letter contained denunciatory language applying to Dr. H. especially! Prevarication and falsehood require much more skill and foresight than Dr. J. possesses to escape self-refutation.*

* In the following letter, Dr. J. correctly describes his present position, exposes its falsehood, and warns the public against such men as himself. His own letter is a complete refutation of his present attack.

** *Eps. E. M. JOURNAL.*—An article recently appeared in the Medical Era, the organ of the Reformed School of Medicine in Louisville, Ky., edited by Prof. J. H. Jordan, over the signature of Prof. C. J. Childs, of that school, in which the writer attempts to prove that the Eclectic Medical School of Cincinnati is fast losing its reformatory character, and relapsing into a state of hunkerism.

The pride which Drs. J. and B. felt in their former colleagues, as long as they were permitted to continue in connexion, is a ludicrous contrast to their change of tone after explosion. Even then, to detach a single member of the Faculty would have been to either of them a matter of immense rejoicing. A visionary and absurd anticipation of the co-operation of Dr. Buchanan was at once communicated to a student as one of the inducements or attractions of Dr. Baldridge's school, taking care, however, that Dr. Buchanan should not be aware of this use of his name. (I would refer to a very honorable gentleman, Dr. J. D. Collins of Ky., as the gentleman who informed me that this inducement was held out to attract him to Dr. Baldridge's school at Louisville.)

The contemptible misrepresentation in reference to Prof. Caldwell requires a simple statement of the facts. Among other measures suggested for the promotion of the prosperity of the school after the death of Dr. Morrow, I recommended (but did not urge as I should have done) the invitation of Prof. Caldwell, the founder of the Louisville Medical Institute, to deliver a course of lectures upon Medical Jurisprudence and Medical Literature—subjects with which he had been familiar as a teacher and author for nearly half a century. The liberality, progressiveness, and moral courage of Dr. C., which had to a great extent impaired his influence among the adherents of Hunkerism, led me to believe that he might be induced to accept such an invitation under proper circumstances. His distinguished career—his vast fund of learning—his lofty position as one of the patriarchs of American medicine, (having been a contemporary, in his younger days, of Rush and the statesmen of the revolution) rendered it highly desirable, if possible, to obtain the influence of so venerable a name in behalf of medical reform. But it was natural that obscure men like Dr. J., who wither away under the shadow of intellectual greatness, should abhor and envy its influence. It is true that Dr. Caldwell is superannuated if superannuation be identical with longevity, for he is about eighty-one years of age, (see History of Kentucky) and like Baron Humboldt at present, who is three years his senior, he exhibits the fact that truly great intellectual men retain their intellectual power, learning and brilliance to the most advanced age. There is not at the present time a more imposing, dignified, learned, intellectually-vigorous and interesting man in the medical profession than Prof. Caldwell. [Since these lines were written Prof. Caldwell has departed this life at Louisville.]

The story in reference to Lane and spirit-rappings is another contemptible misrepresentation. Mr. Lane, a student of the Institute, and regarded as an honorable young man, undertook with the co-operation of other individuals, to get up, by collusion, a counterfeit of the spirit-rapping phenomena, for the purpose of trying how far such an imposition could be successfully carried. In a circle of gentlemen embracing those engaged in the hoax, I was present when his imitations were made. I was at that time investigating the subject, and had not yet seen much evidence of the genuineness of the phenomena. The sounds produced by Mr. Lane were quite different from those which I had supposed to be genuine, and I therefore placed no reliance upon them. The only value of his exhibition consisted in his declaration that he was entirely sincere and was not producing any deception. I was therefore very particular to question him closely and obtain his positive assertion of the genuineness of his proceedings—directing my questions in such a manner as to compel him to confess the deception or to lie in a shameful manner. His veracity being thus pledged, I agreed to commence the investigation, hoping that his veracity might be sustained, but determined to prosecute the investigation until I felt fully authorized to pronounce him either a deceiver or an honest agent of the same wonderful phenomena exhibited truthfully by others. To condemn him as an impostor, without such an investigation, would have been hasty and unjust toward one whom I had never regarded as capable of anything dishonorable. Three interviews (I think) were held with Mr. Lane at the office of Dr. C., (no one being present but ourselves.) I proceeded to test him first by asking questions, and afterwards by examining his

The writer evidently desires to elevate the institution to which he belongs at the expense of the Eclectic Medical Institute of this city, and not, as I conceive, by fair argument, or by maintaining truth, but by making assertions totally destitute of either. Had the article emanated from a different source, I should not have been disappointed; but that Dr. Childs should lend his name to propagate a charge wholly destitute of foundation, occasions in my mind not a little surprise.

The object of the writer no one can mistake. I learn that he and his coadjutors have distributed this article among Eclectics, so far as they could ascertain their location, throughout the West. In it the Dr. invites the friends of true reform in medicine to come to Louisville, where they will get reform pure and unadulterated, in the school to which he belongs; while in Cincinnati they will get a little Homoeopathy, a little reform—very impure, however, and much that is Allopathic, or real hunkerism.

I am much surprised at the arrogance assumed in the declamatory article of the youthful champion of medical reform. A parallel to it is only found in the practices pursued by designing, self-interested, and dishonest politicians.

Now, what are the facts in the case? Not a single man in the Faculty inclines to either Allopathy or Hunkerism, or to Homoeopathy, further than a spirit of enlightened and liberal investigation should prompt him.

Those to whom the practical departments are assigned, are among the oldest, most zealous, firm and devoted advocates of reform in medicine. They are men that have never wavered; they have advocated the imperative necessity of a reform in the healing art, and having earnestly maintained that, although there might be errors and defects in the American system of medical reform, yet they believed that the great principles upon which it was based, presented more to recommend it to the confidence of the public than any other system of medication whatever.

There is at this time not one in the Faculty who believes in the ultra grounds taken by either the Old School or the Homoeopathists. Indeed the School, as now organized, enjoys greater freedom from either influence than it has at any former period since the charter was obtained. All the excrencences and influences adverse or foreign to the most liberal, enlightened and progressive medical reform are cut off. The school is now free, with a better organization, as I verily believe, and with a better prospect for future usefulness and eminence than ever before existed.

I repeat we are now free from uncertain, vacillating, visionary characters on the one hand, and Allopathic hunkerism on the other. With the energy and fixedness of purpose possessed by the present Faculty of the Institute, I trust we shall be prepared to meet and overrule all the false! malicious! and slanderous predictions and publications, designed to injure the cause of Eclecticism or the Eclectic Medical Institute, whether they emanate from open enemies or selfish and interested Reformers, who would dishonor the cause by perverting truth, in order to elevate themselves.

When the Institute abandons the radical reformatory ground which it has ever advocated, and which has exerted such a salutary, though perhaps in many parts silent influence upon the old and destructive mode of medication throughout the country, *I pledge myself to its friends and the friends of the cause, to abandon it*. I admonish them; however, to be upon their guard—to pass such statements, whether emanating from Dr. Childs or any one else, as the machinations of its enemies—as the ebullitions of designing men who wish to build up their individual interests and sustain their own selfish purposes by the injury of the Eclectic Medical Institute.

NOVEMBER, 1851.

L. E. JONES.

mode of producing sounds.* With the assistance of information obtained from a Judge engaged in the plot, he succeeded in giving me answers which being beyond his own probable knowledge, I suspected were derived from the Judge, and on the first opportunity I asked him if he had not furnished Mr. Lane the information in question. It now became obvious that Mr. Lane was only retailing second-hand information in a very blundering manner. Having politely encouraged him to go on until his decided failure was sufficiently palpable and amusing, although I bore a grave countenance, I demanded that, as he had failed in answers, he should submit the sounds to a similar scrutiny, and it appeared that he was incapable of producing any but faint raps on the floor. Examining these, I found that they were produced only under his feet, and finally appeared to be limited to one foot, and taking hold of that foot with my hands, placing one above and the other below it, the raps instantly ceased. Still to my regret Mr. Lane would not confess the imposition, but proposed to give me better evidence in another interview. I attended the next appointment, apprehensive that he would avoid me, but hoping that he would honestly confess the trick. He preferred the former, and kept out of sight from that time. I immediately and with some indignation denounced the whole affair in the presence of his preceptor, Dr. C. and Dr. S. No intelligent person who has fairly and fully witnessed the spiritual phenomena, now doubts that the sounds are produced from a mysterious and invisible source, but any assertion that I was ever convinced of the genuineness of Mr. Lane's sounds is totally untrue. On the contrary I took pains to make known the imposition to those who had believed the phenomena merely from his solemn declarations. The impression made upon the mind of the Judge as he informed me, was that the whole affair gave additional evidence of the truth of the genuine phenomena, since a counterfeit skillfully attempted under the most favorable circumstances had failed of success.

The only credulity of which I confess myself guilty, is that which supposes every man honest until I have some reason to suspect him. This is with me a matter of principle. I confess, too, having been deceived in one instance, by believing for a time the dishonorable accusations of Dr. Jones against Dr. Freeman, which I now know to have been untrue, having learned their falsehood before I personally proposed to Prof. F. to resume his position in the school. The friendly relations between myself, Dr. F. and other members of the Faculty, can no longer be disturbed by the malicious gossip of one whose recklessness is now fully understood, and who has a rare faculty of deceiving, by means of *minute circumstantial gossip artfully distorted and secretly circulated*. This is his sole reliance, for he has been condemned in his whole course with fatal unanimity. The members of the Faculty, nearly all of whom were selected and approved by himself, unanimously condemned his course and were compelled to send him their unanimous request to resign for the good of the Institute. The Board of Trustees selected by himself next almost unanimously expelled him after hearing his tedious defence. The two medical classes also condemned and denounced him as a wilful slanderer, and the Eclectic Physicians of Cincinnati and Covington have condemned him with equal emphasis. No traitorous and factious disturber ever met a more decisive rebuke and condemnation.

The allusions to my lectures during the Spring session are decidedly slanderous in their general import.

The established and necessary custom of the school is to give the anatomical instruction before the weather is too warm, by taking additional time from another chair during the first half of the session. Thus anatomy occupies two hours daily during the first half and physiology two hours daily during the latter half of the session. This arrangement has always been considered proper and satisfactory *by all concerned*, including the present slanderer. The comments of Dr. J. upon this arrangement are merely designed to gull those who know nothing about the matter, knowing that he has already lost the confidence and respect of the students of the Institute, who are acquainted with the facts. The charge of neglecting or being absent from the school has no foundation whatever, except in reference to the Spring session of 1852. Spring sessions are not considered a part of the regular duties of the school, but are in each instance gotten up by the voluntary agreement of such members of the Faculty as are capable of participating. They are a tax upon the Faculty for the benefit of the profession. Before the commencement of the Spring session I expressed my doubts whether I should be able to give a full course of lectures, although I was willing to do all that I could. An absence from my family at Louisville and in infirm health, for more than four months of the winter session, was a painful sacrifice—a sacrifice of a sacred personal duty to public considerations. But as my absence from my family would be required for only seven weeks I hoped that it would not be impracticable. However, although detained longer than I hoped and called off during my lectures by a telegraphic message, I succeeded in giving nearly the whole of the usual course. Yet even if I had been absent during the whole Spring term and not given a single lecture, under such circumstances no one could have justly objected. Neither professor nor student was ever censured for attending to the claims of his own family, which are paramount to all other considerations. Instead of regretting that I did not take more time for the school, I can only say that under the same circumstances again I should probably decline entirely to perform any service during the Spring session. The extreme eagerness of the class for my presence was sufficiently complimentary, and the strong manifestations of interest in every course of lectures that I have given were gratifying to my feelings. The story so circumstantially detailed in reference to expressions of dissatisfaction in the class is based upon the following facts. In my first course of medical lectures, not knowing the kind of instruction to which the students had been accustomed. I proceeded as was customary in other schools by discussing general and philosophical principles before proceeding to details. Students, unaccustomed to such lectures, having never heard a full course upon physiology and the institutes, and not knowing that such lectures were to be followed by the details to which they were introductory, expressed a desire for a different style of lecturing. Perceiving thus that the style which would be most appropriate to a learned treatise was not so well adapted to oral instruction, I immediately modified my course and adopted the plan which I have ever since followed, and I have reason to believe from the complimentary language and resolutions of the class, that this first course of lectures was highly appreciated and esteemed. Indeed I could not desire more complimentary language than what came from that class. The amount of dissatisfaction may be judged from their expression, which was as follows:—

"Dr. Buchanan, we feel a pride in claiming as our professor—a man we believe especially designed and created by Nature for the work of investigation, experiment and reformation, by which our age is so emphatically characterized—and a man in whom the rarest and most varied talents harmoniously blend. * * * * We regard his discoveries in Neurological, Pathological, and Physiological sciences

* As Mr. L. professed to be an honest medium unjustly persecuted by imputations against his honor and character the benefit of all that he could exhibit, I had no hesitation in doing him justice and request a copy of the memorandum of the experiments, to which he was entitled in the *Medical Times*, and I forwarded them as far as possible and in the *Journal of Man* (No. 1, vol. 3.) I spoke of his very first experiments as looking "like a humbug" before I had traced out the mode of his imposition.

as calculated to fill an immense blank in the former, and to dissipate immense ignorance in the latter—and as furnishing the only rational view of that hitherto obscure organ, the brain, in its relations mentally and its functions physiologically, and making plain and comprehensible the relations of mind and matter, which have ever been involved in darkness and mystery. Dr. B. already occupies an enviable position before the public, and being far in advance of his age in scientific research, we feel assured that, however much his generation fail to appreciate his invaluable contributions to science, posterity will fully recognize his claim to pre-eminence among the distinguished of the nineteenth century. Happy in his capacity as lecturer, impressive in his manner as a professor, and original in many of his views as a teacher, we consider his co-operation as arguing well for the future prosperity and final triumph of the E. M. Institute. As an expositor of Physiological science, we believe he is above comparison with any known contemporary of this or any country."

I am not aware that any lecturer or teacher of novel sciences ever had more harmonious relations with his classes than myself. That those who have never attended a full course of instruction in cerebral science are often prejudiced against it, because they do not understand it, is true, but among those who have attended my courses I have never failed to recognize a general sentiment of approbation and interest as well as of confidence in the special facts upon which my doctrines are based. The following extracts from the resolutions of one of my private classes, in the Institute, present a fair example of the sentiments of all. They have not always made a formal expression of their sentiments, simply for the reason that it was not considered necessary, any more than it would be in reference to the old system of phrenology, after it had survived the early opposition. I could refer to far more serious opposition and objection to the teaching of Spurzheim by his pupils than any which I have ever encountered.

"While, therefore, we gratefully accord distinguished honor to the labors of Gall and his coadjutors, we do, at the same time, regard the contributions which have been made to Anthropology by Dr. Buchanan as far exceeding those of his predecessors."

"With the general assent of my classes I have been entirely satisfied. To pronounce upon the correctness of all the details of a science of infinite extent would be impossible to any mere student, and would but an exhibition of faith in my infallibility—such faith I have never demanded or expected.

Finally, overreaching himself, Dr. Jones becomes altogether too complimentary. If it were true, as he says, that I objected to him from the first and endeavored to procure his removal, I should be much pleased myself to proclaim a fact so creditable to my foresight. But I can not claim the honor. I supposed that, although there were many objections to him, especially among the most intelligent portions of the class, his caution and self-interest would prevent him from inflicting any serious injury on the Institute. Hence, like the rest of the Faculty, I respected his pre-emption right, which was never disturbed until he had repeatedly endangered a dissolution of the Institute. Removals have always been governed by a consideration of the welfare of the Institute, and I have never desired or proposed a change in that way which has not been sanctioned by my colleagues and carried into effect—not because I governed them, but because all were governed by a desire for the welfare of the school. I can not claim to have over-awed faculties, managed classes, and played the dictator in general. It does not appear that any member of the Faculty ever spoke behind my back what he would not dare to utter to my face with the solitary exception of Dr. Jones himself, who takes his own fears of what even in his rage he has called the "commanding talents" of myself as a measure of the spirit of his colleagues. I have been content to do my duty, to keep the Institute in an honorable position before the public, to vindicate its reputation, to labor for harmony and co-operation, to assist in removing incumbrances and quelling discord, to urge forward every practicable measure of improvement and elevation, and especially to introduce the great liberal movement of opening our doors by a system of cheap education. Whether without these labors the Institute could have attained its influential position and have held together a respectable Faculty for a series of years, is known to those who are acquainted with its private history.

REPLY OF PROF. HOYT TO THE PERSONAL ATTACK OF DR. L. E. JONES.

Having just glanced through another contemptible pamphlet in which my name has been made conspicuous in the use of base misrepresentation and vulgar scandal, from the envenomed pen of that prolific source of the vilest calumnies, Dr. L. E. Jones, it becomes my duty, howmuchsoever I may loathe the task, to confront and expose, so far as I am concerned, the slanderous assaults of its meanly unscrupulous author.

The first thing which attracts my attention is the ludicrous effort of the Dr. to swear in polite language—the extreme difficulty of which will be readily appreciated by such as have ever been in any way intimately associated with him. The entire document, from beginning to end, being one fierce array of half-suppressed oaths—the author's bile vainly attempting to supply the place of intellect.

A second very interesting feature of the pamphlet is its consistency—alternations of abuse and compliment.

The Faculty are made to disparage and even abuse Prof. Buchanan at sundry times—to say he is a curse to the school and should be removed, and yet to cling to him with a blind obstinate tenacity as if he were the very life and soul of the Institute—the fabricator alleging at the close of this beautifully incongruous fabrication, as a sort of by-way through which to escape from the dilemma, that the Faculty have always stood in appalling fear of Dr. B., as if he were an incarnate devil. Fear of what?

It is sufficiently clear that Dr. J., too stupid to see moral worth when it is so manifestly present, very magnanimously invests other men with his own attributes, never stopping to ask whether his supposition be correct.

Possessed of no magnanimity himself, but ever prompted by the most meanly selfish motives, and incited by envy and a thousand petty jealousies, too contemptible for a man of soul to contemplate, and heartily devoted to the destruction of every interest which does not involve his own, he doubtless felt a necessity to believe that Dr. Buchanan would be actuated by similar motives, and avenge himself on his opposers by a life-long warfare against each individual, the Institution itself, and the cause for which it was established.

The next, and perhaps the most interesting feature of all, is the facility with which the author substitutes his own for the language of others—a thing which before all others a man of delicacy and refined taste would deprecate—with the utmost ease making them say impossible things.

Thus I am made to speak very disparagingly of Prof. B., and to use the *very language which he himself uttered* in his frenzied ravings whenever the slightest opportunity offered for dragging Professor B. into our conversation—language, too, which in more instances than one, I received with becoming indignation and took occasion to rebuke, as did also, in appropriate terms, one of his boarders last winter.

The opinion of Prof. B., to which the Dr. refers as expressed over my name in a certificate contained in a pamphlet recently published for the exposure of his calumnious misrepresentations, is that which I have ever entertained and freely expressed—the declaration of Dr. Jones that he “*has too much confidence*” in me to believe I would tell truth (!) to the contrary notwithstanding.

Regarding Prof. Buchanan as a man of brilliant genius, profound learning and superior philanthropy, a noble, heroic champion of Truth and Right, pledged by his very nature to a zealous and life-long devotion to all great humanitarian ends, and withal a man in every act of whose social life the most honorable sentiments are visible, my admiration and love would have been *compelled* had I willed it otherwise. And even Dr. Jones himself, antipodal as he is, yielded to the necessity of always speaking in terms of high commendation until jealous of Prof. B.’s popularity and disturbed by imaginary fears of the increasing size of his private classes, he saw him suddenly transmuted from a most admirable and excellent to a basely false, hypocritical, and selfish man. O, Almighty Dollar, how wondrous thy transforming power! Such littleness, such corroding envy, and such short-sighted malice I could not have believed had not my daily and intimate business connexion with Dr. J. compelled me to witness, month after month, the true undisguised sentiments and character of the man.

That I ever “interceded” with Dr. J. for the chair of Chemistry I declare to be utterly false. He himself first introduced the subject, stating that he had conversed with one or two members of the Faculty in view of Prof. Sander’s resignation, and they entertained no doubt I could be elected to fill the vacancy; whereupon I expressed a willingness to receive the appointment in case the request was unanimous, and forthwith made arrangements accordingly. To show that I did not—as it appears Dr. Jones in his own case does—deem a professorship in the E. M. Institute absolutely essential to my existence, I will say that I promptly declined the offer of either the chair of Anatomy or of Materia Medica.

That while lecturing on Toxicology during the past session, I incidentally mentioned a case occurring under my own observation, in which a mixture of two poisonous substances (which any *tyro* knows is not Homoeopathic,) had actually cured a case of ague, is true. And I would remark, that one must be a miserable slave to party spirit who would fear to mention any fact, whether it harmonized with one theory or another.

But that I ever instituted a comparison between Eclecticism and Homoeopathy, unfavorable to the former, I distinctly deny; and I can not but feel mortified that any man professing to be an Eclectic should have such despicably mean and narrow views of Eclecticism as to attempt to bound it on the North, East, South and West by Lobelia, Leptandrion, Sanguinaria, and Podophylin. If, as Eclectics; we are to confine ourselves to the self-same agents which any pioneer, however worthy, was accustomed to use, and obstinately close our eyes to everything new and old, not included in a brief catalogue, to whom, I ask, could the opprobrious title of sectarian bigot apply with more appropriateness than to us? If such Thompsonian bigotry should be called Eclectic, then am I no Eclectic.

But if that philosophy which, taking a dignified and impartial stand, closely watches the operation of every known law—not failing, however, to ever attempt the discovery of new laws—and which in any given case of disease seeks to appropriate the safest, most effectual, and most sanative means afforded in nature,—which aims to study man in his true nature and in all his relations, and adapt its course to meet every demand of that nature, be the *true* philosophy; if to acknowledge no restriction of choice—in a word, if to be a *free thinker* and *free chooser* will constitute me such, then am I a *true Eclectic*, and as such am I regarded by all who have heard my course of instruction.

But with such men as Drs. Jones and Baldridge—two modern petrifications—the latter of whom, notwithstanding the ridicule and contempt, to my own personal knowledge, heaped upon him by the former, now sweetly fraternizes with him—I can not but expect to sympathize. And although familiar with the scientific attainments of Dr. Jones—he having spent many days and nights in the laborious effort to transform his writings into some respectable shape—a labor about equal to that of their first production—I am not disposed to assist him any longer in imposing upon the public by showing off in borrowed plumage. He may enjoy the benefit of my past laborious assistance, but I am not willing that my own independent writings shall be hereafter imposed upon the public as the veritable productions of Dr. L. E. Jones. This is a sufficient explanation of the peculiar malice which he now displays in his assaults upon myself.

Attacks upon the Institute by an expelled individual, only mark his own character. Every professor who has left the Institute with credit and respectability (of whom there have been six or seven) has continued the previous friendly relations with the Institute, but every one who has left in dishonor (of whom there have been four) has denounced, abused, and slandered the Faculty and the Institute, as such men always will.

But to spend time in refuting all the base insinuations and direct charges of this ridiculous document were useless. Many of them are so palpably false and inconsistent as to thoroughly refute themselves. And I will only say in conclusion, that, I feel inexpressible regret that men who once held professorships in the E. M. Institute should, in their present condition of depreciation and self-degradation, be, in the mind of the public, in any way connected with the noble cause which it has become my duty and pride to labor for and defend.

J. W. HOYT.

NOTE FROM DR. WARRINER.

DR. BUCHANAN:

Cincinnati, July 6, 1853.

Dear Sir: In the recently published pamphlet of Ex-professor Jones, I notice a casual allusion to myself in connexion with Prof. Hoyt. I am much obliged to Dr. Jones for the unmerited and quite unexpected compliment he flings me, but I must protest against being classed with those who acknowledge their inability to understand your teachings in cerebral science. I have not suffered from any such unfortunate mental obtuseness. Certainly it has always been sufficiently apparent that there was no lack of directness, precision or lucidity in your method of instruction. I have occasionally held conversations upon your system with Prof. Hoyt, and have criticised certain points freely, just as I would in a similar conversation with yourself or any other person. But surely Prof. H. could never have cited me as an instance of the cases alluded to in that pamphlet. And let me say for Dr. Hoyt that during several years most intimate acquaintance with him as fellow student and social friend, I have never heard from him any remarks, respecting you or your doctrines, which he would not now freely make to yourself, nor any at all resembling those attributed to him in that pamphlet. And verily there has been no lack of freedom between us in our discussions of all men, topics and things that have arrested our attention.

Yours truly, H. A. WARRINER.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 02703782 4